



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/084,895	02/28/2002	Phillip King Parell	581	8202
27777	7590	04/27/2009	EXAMINER	
PHILIP S. JOHNSON JOHNSON & JOHNSON ONE JOHNSON & JOHNSON PLAZA NEW BRUNSWICK, NJ 08933-7003			HONG, JOHN C	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
		3726		
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
04/27/2009	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/084,895	Applicant(s) PARELL ET AL.
	Examiner JOHN C. HONG	Art Unit 3726

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 February 2009.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9,10,14,15,20,22-33 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 12 and 13 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-8,11,16-19,21 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 0/7/08;9/27/04;6/21/02.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election of claims 7,8,12 and 13 in the reply filed on 2/17/09 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1,4,5-8 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stoy et al. (U.S. Patent 4,173,606).

Stoy et al. disclose : Regarding Claims 1,4,5-8 and 11, a tip comprising : a substantially rigid body portion (16) having a distal end and a proximal end, the distal end having an outer surface that is complementary to the shape of a lens mold portion to be handled, the body portion having sealing means (19) peripheral to the outer surface for engagement with the lens mold portion; and at least one aperture(17) extending through the body portion from said outer surface to the proximal end (Fig. 4; col. 10, lines 40-48)

A claim containing a "recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus" if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1987).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 16-19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stoy et al. (U.S. Patent 4,173,606).

Stoy et al. teach a system comprising: assembly having a tip having a substantially rigid body, the body portion having a distal end and a proximal end, the distal end having an outer surface that is complementary to the shape of the lens mold half to be handled, the body portion having sealing means peripheral to the outer surface for engagement with the lens mold half, the tip having at least one aperture extending through the body portion from the distal end to said proximal end (Fig. 4; col. 10, lines 40-48).

Stoy et al. fail to teach a robotic assembly having a transport tip and a source of pressure differential in flow communication with the at least one aperture at the proximal end.

But it is well known in the art utilizing a robotic assembly having a transport tip and a source of pressure differential in flow communication with the at least one aperture, and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to utilizing a robotic assembly having a transport tip and a source of pressure differential in flow

communication with the at least one aperture to the tip of Stoy et al. so as to effective manufacturing of the ophthalmic lens.

A claim containing a "recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus" if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim. *Ex parte Masham, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1987).*

5. Claims 2,3,16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stoy et al. (U.S. Patent 4,173,606).

Regarding the hardness of the rigid body portion material, it would have been obvious matter of design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the rigid body portion of the transfer tip with hardness about 58-90/75-90.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 12,13 are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOHN C. HONG whose telephone number is 571-272-4529. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-17:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, DAVID BRYANT can be reached on 571-272-4526. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/JOHN C HONG/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3726

Jh
2/25/09